

University of Northern Iowa
UNI ScholarWorks

Documents - Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate

4-8-1996

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 8, 1996

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1996 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 8, 1996" (1996). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 801.
https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/801

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

FACULTY SENATE

April 8, 1996

1505

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the March 25, 1996, Senate meeting were approved with editorial changes suggested by David Crownfield.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Call for press identification: No representatives of the press were present.
2. Comments from Chair Gable: The Chair reminded senators of the open meeting of the Student Outcomes Assessment Committee this Friday and the general faculty meeting Monday, April 15 to consider the recommendations in the Senate's Ad Hoc Committee on Quality in the Curriculum. The Chair reviewed the Senate's procedures for nominating Senate officers for the 1996-1997 academic year. The Chair asked senators to be prepared for long meetings until the calendar and docket is cleared.
3. Barbara Lounsberry, Chair of the Faculty, requested Senator's assistance with checking voting and non-voting faculty and balloting at the general faculty meeting Monday, April 15, 1996.
4. Comments from Provost Marlin: The Provost updated the Senate on legislative progress of the 1997 FY budget. Senators were informed that the following reports would be presented to the Board of Regents at their meeting here at UNI, Monday, April 15, 1996: Academic Program Review, Tenure and Promotion, and Child Care. The Board will also consider the name change for the Department of Sociology and Anthropology and the exterior of the Performing Arts/Classroom Building.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

- 593 Request from the Department of Educational Administration and Counseling to change its name to Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling and Postsecondary Education. Cawelti/Lounsberry moved/seconded to docket in regular order. Motion carried. Docket 521.
- 594 Request from Linda A. Fernandez that the Faculty Senate support the implementation of a pesticide-free lawn policy. Soneson/Cawelti moved/seconded to docket in regular order. Motion carried. Docket 522.
- 595 Request for Emeritus Status from Barbara Pershing, Department of Design, Family, and Consumer Science, Robert D. Talbott, Department of History, and Francis J. Winter, Department of Political Science. Primrose/Gilpin moved/seconded to place at head of the docket, out of regular order. Motion carried. Docket 523.
- 596 Review policy adopted May 18, 1995, that the Senate "try, on a one-year basis, to send a summary of the senate meeting to faculty shortly after the meeting, with the Chair (of the Senate) establishing the means of distribution, either e-mail or paper copy, and for the Secretary to type and distribute to the Senators the unedited archive copy of the minutes to be approved by the Senate body at the next senate meeting, at which time the body would make corrections as necessary. The full copy would be distributed to all faculty after approval from the Senate." De Nault/Cooper moved/seconded to docket in regular order. Motion carried. Docket 524.
- 597 Response from the General Education Committee to the Senate's request to review the Recommendations of the Senate's Ad Hoc Committee on Quality in the Curriculum. De Nault/Cawelti moved/seconded to docket in regular order. Motion carried. Docket 525.
- 598 Report from the Senate Ad Hoc Committee to Prepare a Response to the Working Draft of the University Strategic Plan Dated February 1, 1996. Gilpin/De Nault moved/seconded to place at head of docket, out of regular order. Motion carried. Docket 526.

NEW BUSINESS

Grosboll distributed suggestions for a University Faculty Senate Handbook that she and Senator Schroeder have been working on.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

- 526 598 Report from the Senate Ad Hoc Committee to Prepare a Response to the Working Draft of the University Strategic Plan Dated February 1, 1996. Gilpin/Soneson moved/seconded to review the report of the Committee. Motion carried. Amend/Yousefi moved/seconded to ask the Committee to consult with representatives of the Academic Affairs Council and report back to the University Senate. Motion carried.
- 523 595 Request for Emeritus Status from Barbara Pershing, Department of Design, Family, and Consumer Science, Robert D. Talbott, Department of History, and Francis J. Winter, Department of Political Science. Amend/Primrose moved to grant emeritus status to Barbara Pershing, Robert D. Talbott, and Francis J. Winter and commend them for their service to the University. Motion carried.
- 517 589 Report of the University Committee on Curricula and the Graduate Council. Amend/Yousefi moved/seconded to approve the curriculum package from the College of Business. Cooper/Primrose moved/seconded to amend the motion to approve the curriculum package from the College of Education to withhold approval for Course 210:193 (no hours specified); the statement on page 25, second paragraph of Physical Education Major that "Physical Education Major students are required to have a 2.00 UNI grade point average and a 2.25 grade point average in 420:xxx courses to be eligible to register for 420:197"; Option I of the proposed Physical Education Major on page 25, and the statement "Students must maintain a 2.50 GPA" under Physical Education Major-Teaching, p. 28. Motion to amend carried. Main motion, as amended, carried. Haack/Cawelti moved/seconded to approve the curriculum package from the College of Humanities and Fine Arts. Motion carried. Amend/Cawelti moved/seconded to change the name of the Latin American and Caribbean Studies Committee to the Inter-American Studies Committee. Motion carried. Haack/De Nault moved/seconded to approve the curriculum package from the College of Natural Sciences. Motion carried. Soneson/Henderson moved/seconded to approve the curriculum package from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Amend/Cawelti moved/seconded to adjourn. Motion carried.

CALL TO ORDER

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Chair Gable at 3:30 PM in the Board Room, Gilchrist Hall.

Present: Mahmood Yousefi, Randall Krieg, Sherry Gable, Carol Cooper, Ed Amend, Scott Cawelti, Martha Reineke, Jerome Soneson, Ken De Nault, Paul Shand, Joel Haack, Andrew Gilpin, Katherine Van Wormer, Barbara Weeg, Sue Grosboll, Phil Patton, Barbara Lounsberry (ex-officio) and Forrest Conklin, Parliamentarian (non voting).

Alternates: Eric Henderson for Surendar Yadava and Jacquelin Smith for Merrie Schroeder.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of March 25, 1996, Senate meeting were approved with editorial changes suggested by David Crownfield.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Call for press identification: No representatives of the press were present.
2. Comments from Chair Gable:
 - The Chair reminded senators of the open meeting of the Student Outcomes Assessment Committee this Friday and the general faculty meeting Monday, April 15 to consider the recommendations in the Senate's Ad Hoc Committee on Quality in the Curriculum.
 - The Chair reviewed the Senate's procedures for nominating Senate officers for next year. The procedures are for the outgoing senators to form the nominating committee. Because several of the

procedures are for the outgoing senators to form the nominating committee. Because several of the senators whose terms expire are running for reelection, the Chair will form the nominating committee as soon as the outcomes of these elections are known.

- The Chair asked senators to be prepared for long meetings until the calendar and docket is cleared.
- 3. Barbara Lounsberry, Chair of the Faculty, requested Senator's assistance with checking voting and non-voting faculty and balloting at the general faculty meeting Monday, April 15, 1996.
- 4. Comments from Provost Marlin.
 - The Provost updated the Senate on legislative progress of the 1997 FY budget. The legislature has been occupied with various options for tax relief. It is anticipated that action on the budget will take place soon because legislator's daily allowance ends next week.
 - Senators were informed that the following reports would be presented to the Board of Regents at their meeting here at UNI, Monday, April 15, 1996: Academic Program Review, Tenure and Promotion, and Child Care. The Board will also consider the name change for the Department of Sociology and Anthropology and the exterior of the Performing Arts/Classroom Building.
 - The Provost urged senators to attend the faculty meeting on Monday, April 15, 1996.
 - The Provost brought to Senator's attention the favorable article in the April 5th issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education about the College of Education's program in Slovakia.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

- 593 Request from the Department of Educational Administration and Counseling to change its name to Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling and Postsecondary Education.

Cawelti/Lounsberry moved/seconded to docket in regular order. Motion carried. Docket 521.

- 594 Request from Linda A. Fernandez that the Faculty Senate support the implementation of a pesticide-free lawn policy.

Soneson/Cawelti moved/seconded to docket in regular order. Motion carried. Docket 522.

- 595 Request for Emeritus Status from Barbara Pershing, Department of Design, Family, and Consumer Science, Robert D. Talbott, Department of History, and Francis J. Winter, Department of Political Science.

Primrose/Gilpin moved/seconded to place at head of the docket, out of regular order. Motion carried. Docket 523.

- 596 Review policy adopted May 18, 1995, that the Senate "try, on a one-year basis, to send a summary of the senate meeting to faculty shortly after the meeting, with the Chair (of the Senate) establishing the means of distribution, either e-mail or paper copy, and for the Secretary to type and distribute to the Senators the unedited archive copy of the minutes to be approved by the Senate body at the next senate meeting, at which time the body would make corrections as necessary. The full copy would be distributed to all faculty after approval from the Senate."

De Nault/Cooper moved/seconded to docket in regular order. Motion carried. Docket 524.

- 597 Response from the General Education Committee to the Senate's request to review the Recommendations of the Senate's Ad Hoc Committee on Quality in the Curriculum. De Nault/Cawelti moved/seconded to docket in regular order. Motion carried. Docket 525.

- 598 Report from the Senate Ad Hoc Committee to Prepare a Response to the Working Draft of the University Strategic Plan Dated February 1, 1996.

Gilpin/De Nault moved/seconded to place at head of docket, out of regular order. Motion carried. Docket 526.

NEW BUSINESS

Grosboll distributed suggestions for a University Faculty Senate Handbook that she and Senator Schroeder have been working on.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

- 526 598 Report from the Senate Ad Hoc Committee to Prepare a Response to the Working Draft of the University Strategic Plan Dated February 1, 1996. Gilpin/Soneson moved/seconded to review the report of the Committee. Motion carried.

Gilpin spoke of the necessity to move quickly on the document because of the President's requirement that the Senate and the Academic Affairs Council present a coordinated response to the working draft of the Strategic Plan by May 3, 1996. He inquired if all senators had received a copy of the response of the Academic Affairs Council.

Gilpin/Soneson moved/seconded to review the Committee's report. Motion carried.

Cooper remarked that the document carried the language "assure compensation" for teaching and scholarship, but similar language was missing for service. Because faculty have a tripartite mission, the three areas should be dealt with equally in the document.

Gilpin stated that the next step should be for representatives of the Senate to meet with representatives of the Academic Affairs Council. According to the memo from the Provost, the representatives of the Academic Affairs Council would be Jim Lubker, Aaron Podolefsky, and Herb Safford.

Cawelti stated that there were some substantial issues in the documents. He wondered if senators, and others, could e-mail comments and concerns to Gilpin. Gilpin stated that they could.

Reineke remarked about the difference between the revisions suggested by the Academic Affairs Council and the Ad Hoc Committee. The Academic Affairs Council contains specific deletions and insertions into the Working Draft of the Strategic Plan whereas the Senate's Ad Hoc Committee's document contains narrative. She expressed concern about the difference in communication. The ideas in the Committee's response were very good but they could be weakened because they are not as close to a decision-making format. The Committee's suggestions might just get stuck in the narrative and not be brought to the table.

Gilpin suggested that one possibility was to create a synthesis of the two documents that would incorporate the narrative of the Senate's Committee with the specific changes of the Academic Affairs Council's document.

Reineke noted that the Senate's document suggests deletions in which case the rationale would be necessary. Cawelti stated that the two documents worked well together. The Senate's document gives the rationale and the Academic Affairs Council's gives the action.

Amend liked the removal of the terms "ethical" and "caring" from the document.

De Nault wanted clarification from the Senate as to its wishes concerning further action by the Ad Hoc Committee. Did the Senate wish that the Ad Hoc Committee meet with the representatives of the Academic Affairs Council? He felt that a motion providing direction to the Committee would be helpful.

Grosboll questioned whether the document created by such a meeting would be brought back to the Senate. Gilpin stated that he assumed that whatever document was created would be brought back to the Senate for review as well as to the Academic Affairs Council for their review.

Amend/Yousefi moved/seconded to ask the Committee to consult with representatives of the Academic Affairs Council and report back to the University Senate. Motion carried.

- 523 595 Request for Emeritus Status from Barbara Pershing, Department of Design, Family, and Consumer Science, Robert D. Talbott, Department of History, and Francis J. Winter, Department of Political Science.

Amend/Primrose moved to grant emeritus status to Barbara Pershing, Robert D. Talbott, and Francis J. Winter and commend them for their service to the University. Motion carried.

- 517 589 Report of the University Committee on Curricula and the Graduate Council.

Chair Gable expressed thanks to Reinhold Bubser, Chair of the Curricula Committee, Keith Crew, Chair of the Graduate College, Paul Chao, Chair of the Graduate College Curricula Committee and the members of these committees. The Chair thanked the College Curriculum Committees and Department Curricular Committees. The Chair thanked and made special mention of the work of Coleen Wagner in preparing the curricular documents.

The Chair reviewed the seven actions the Senate could take in addition to determining if the proposals are correct, complete, and consistent. The Chair had previously had the Secretary distribute the appropriate sections of the Policies and Procedures Manual to senators.

Amend/Yousefi moved/seconded to approve the curriculum package from the College of Business.

Amend remarked that the course descriptions in many of the proposals were repetitions, excessively verbose, and filled with jargon. The Catalogue has two functions. On the one hand it is a contract and needs to be understandable. On the other hand, the Catalogue needs to communicate our curriculum. There needs to be a better presentation to the public.

Gable stated that the Senate does not have the prerogative to rewrite course descriptions. Any changes suggested by the Senate would have to be sent back to the initiating department for their approval. Amend argued for clarity in course descriptions.

Cooper asked about impact statements regarding new minors. Bubser replied that impact statements have not been sent to the Senate in the past.

Cooper asked if the new minors would increase student enrollment and would this increase be handled by larger classes.

Motion to approve the curriculum package from the College of Business carried.

Cooper/Primrose moved/seconded to approve the curriculum package from the College of Education.

Weeg expressed concern about impact statements that state that more library resources will be needed. The library does not have an infinite pool of money. To purchase resources for new programs will require a concomitant decrease in the purchase of resources for other programs.

Gable asked Provost Marlin the significance of the signatures on the Budget Implication Sheets (Form G).

Provost Marlin stated that she did not know. She was not involved in curriculum development.

Chair Gable asked the Deans the significance of the signatures on the Budget Implication Sheets.

No dean replied.

Chair Gable asked the Department Heads the significance of the signatures on the Budget Implication Sheets.

Gretta Berghammer (Head, Department of Theater) stated that signing off that there are no budget implications means that you do not need an additional line. If you sign off that there are budget implications you need to state what they are, such as personnel or supplies and services.

Provost Marlin stated that everyone realizes that there are budget implications with new courses even if you state that no new faculty are needed. If you are teaching a new course it means you are not teaching something else. She expressed her concern that there is no reasonable linkage between the curricular process and the budgetary process except after we have added all these new courses or new programs and then we have to find the money to fund them.

De Nault expressed dismay. He has listened to administrators complain about the lack of coordination and knowledge of budget yet there has always been a budget implication sheet with every new course and program. He had always assumed that the signature of the administrators on the document meant that the resources needed for the course or program were taken care of. Faculty have never had the authority or responsibility to see that funds were obtained. If the budget sheet is meaningful, he thought that the signatures of the administrators meant that funds were somehow available for that proposal. Faculty do not construct or approve budgets. If these sheets do not mean that funds will be available, what do they mean?

Grosboll asked for some clarification about the expressed need for library services. When these are signed off by department heads and deans does this mean that there has been communication with the library?

Haack replied that the sheets provided information to the dean from the department about the best estimate of the cost of the course or program. The library ought to be getting copies of what the department heads and deans are signing off. The CNS Senate has raised issues when the cost of a new program is higher than what a senator feels is appropriate.

Gable stated that there were actually two sheets with budget implications, Form G which was an internal document and Form I which is sent to the Board of Regents. Most of the time Form I states that no new funds are needed. Are we then saying to the Board that we do not need funds to support these new degrees.

Kate Martin (Library) spoke to the matter of library resources. The library has a representative on the University Curriculum Committee. In some instances departments do come to the library and request help during the development of a curriculum proposal. In other cases, the library does not see the budgetary implications until it comes to the University Curriculum Committee. At that time they are careful to talk to individual departments about their assessment of library resources and the source of these funds, which usually must come from reallocation from existing programs. While the library has representation on the University Curriculum Committee there is no such representation on the Graduate Curriculum Committee.

Lounsberry questioned whether there is consultation if money is redirected. Martin replied that the library tries to consult with the department. This consultation did take place with the Department of Curriculum and Instruction regarding their proposal. However, if new programs result in increased enrollment, the library will take this into account when they determine budgets.

Yousefi stated that part of the problem is that there is confusion between budgetary allocation and

economic cost. While budgetary allocation may not change, a new program will require the shifting of resources. Thus, though there may be no budgetary cost there is an economic cost.

Gable questioned course 210:193. There are no hours listed for the course. Bubser responded that the hours should be 2 to 4 hours.

Gable questioned the inconsistency in the budget Implications of Curriculum Changes (Form G) and the Regents Program Review Questions (Form I) for the new masters program, Teaching Technology. Form G states that no new staff resources are needed but Form I states that \$35,000 will be needed for faculty.

Sharon Smaldino (Curriculum and Instruction) stated that when the proposal was put together this was a faculty line that had been requested for about 5 or 6 years. The proposal is a merger of two existing masters programs. This faculty need has been present for several years. When the program was originally prepared, the request for funds was placed in the document. However, to get signatures they had to delete this request. The document that was sent to the senate did not have the request removed.

Gable asked how many students are enrolled in the existing two programs. Smaldino replied that the enrollment is between 80 to 100 students.

De Nault remarked that he was concerned with the number of clerical errors in the documents. Documents should be thoroughly proofed before they leave a department. He has heard a lot of criticism of the curricular process. He felt that the process was good but the implementation at the department level was poor. He stated that department heads have the responsibility to see that documents leaving their department are accurate.

Cooper questioned the advising statement, "Students must maintain a 2.50 GPA," on page 28 of the proposal under Physical Education Major -Teaching. The statement is unclear. There is a standard GPA statement for teaching majors.

Cooper asked for clarification of the statement "Admission may be limited due to student/instructor ratio" under the Athletic Training Minor on page 28. Cooper wondered where the criteria are publicly stated. How are students selected for the program. The criteria should be clearly stated.

Carol Phillips (Physical Education) replied that admission has been controlled by advising. Any student who is interested in the minor has seen the program advisor who works with them on the program. If that needs to be published in the catalogue rather than by advising, that could be done.

Cooper replied that she wanted to ensure that there were clear criteria so that students understand why someone gets into the program and someone else does not.

Cooper pointed out that the Department of Mathematics defines middle level as 4 to 8 whereas the College of Education defines middle level as 4 to 9. Cooper felt that there should be consistency in the use of the terms.

Gable raised questions about paragraph two under Physical Education Major on page 25 regarding the grade point requirements. Some of the courses in Option I of the proposed program require a 2.50 GPA and entrance into Teacher Education. Cooper suggested withholding approval for all of option I until the prerequisites have been reviewed.

Cooper/Primrose moved/seconded to amend the motion to approve the curriculum package from the College of Education to withhold approval for Course 210:193 (no hours specified); the statement on page 25, second paragraph of Physical Education Major that "Physical Education Major students are required to have a 2.00 UNI grade point average and a 2.25 grade point average in 420:xxx courses to

be eligible to register for 420:197"; Option I of the proposed Physical Education Major on page 25, and the statement "Students must maintain a 2.50 GPA" under Physical Education Major-Teaching, p. 28. Motion carried.

Main motion, as amended, carried.

Haack/Cawelti moved/seconded to approve the curriculum package from the College of Humanities and Fine Arts. Motion carried.

Amend raised questions about the Inter-American Studies Major. There does not seem to be either the coherence or the substance for a major. He questioned the procedure of creating programs that have few courses in a discipline with a lot of courses added from other fields and calling the program "interdisciplinary". There is no opportunity to achieve any interdisciplinary depth. In this proposal there are only 27 hours in the common core.

Mike Millar, Chair of the Latin American and Caribbean Studies Committee, replied that the basic thrust of this major is to interweave various countries and regions in the hemisphere. In the current Latin American Studies major, students take either or Spanish or Portuguese and then a collection of courses from the social sciences and two specific courses from history. The Committee felt that it was appropriate to ensure that students had some courses in some areas such as environmental studies, geography, computer science, etc. The common core is designed to give students breadth and the emphases are designed to give students depth.

Lounsberry asked why Introduction to College Writing is listed as one of the electives in Emphasis Area 4. This is an introductory, general education course.

Millar replied that this was to ensure that there were no hidden prerequisites for other courses in the Emphasis Area.

Lounsberry reiterated her concern about listing this course as applicable to a major. There were other courses that would be more appropriate for a major.

Weeg asked if Introduction to College Writing could be taken for credit in an English Major.

Lounsberry replied that you could not. Weeg then questioned the use of this course for credit in a Humanities and Fine Arts Emphasis Area.

Haack stated that even dropping 620:005 as a specific listed course still leaves 12 hours in the Emphasis Area.

Amend asked about the use of 620:186, Studies in This course could be just about anything.

Cawelti questioned the use of 620:186. Anyone who works up a course they want to offer calls it 186, Studies in It does not matter what the course is about.

De Nault questioned the inclusion of "Environmental Studies" as an area of emphasis. Volcanoes, earthquakes, and geologic setting have certainly played a part in the history of Latin America, but taking Physical Geology, Earth History, and Environmental Geology did not prepare a student to be an expert in environmental studies.

Grosboll responded that the committee wanted to include environmental studies because of the impact environmental issues have on the relationships between countries.

Motion to approve the curricula package from the College of Humanities and Fine Arts carried.

De Nault introduced a request from the Latin American Studies Committee to change its name to the Inter-American Studies Committee if the restatement of the Latin American Studies Major was approved.

Amend/Cawelti moved/seconded to change the name of the Latin American and Caribbean Studies Committee to the Inter-American Studies Committee. Motion carried.

Haack/De Nault moved/seconded to approve the curriculum package from the College of Natural Sciences.

Amend criticized the description of the proposed course 870:123g, The Atmospheric Environment (page 22) as being too verbose. De Nault responded that the description meet previous criticism that course descriptions specify what was to be covered.

Weeg questioned the use of interlibrary loan as a resource for the new Master of Science Degree - Major in Biology (page 97). Interlibrary loan is designed to supplement library holdings. It is not a method to procure research holdings. The library will do the best it can to meet the needs of the curriculum but interlibrary loan is not the way to get material. The statement expresses a misunderstanding about the purpose of interlibrary loan. Interlibrary loan is a method to supplement library holdings. There are other ways for procuring material including students and faculty purchasing copies of texts and articles.

Yousefi stated his concern about the statement that there is no extra costs incurred. With regard to budget there may be no additional expenditures needed, but every time you offer course A and by doing so you cannot offer course B, there is a cost.

Motion to approve the curriculum package from the College of Natural Sciences carried.

Soneson/Henderson moved/seconded to approve the curriculum package from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences.

Motion to approve the curriculum package from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Amend/Cawelti moved/seconded to adjourn.

The Chair could not determine the outcome of the voice vote and called for a division of the house.

The division showed 9 in favor of adjournment and 6 opposed to adjournment. Motion carried.

The Senate adjourned at 5:23 PM.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth J. De Nault, Secretary
University Faculty Senate

Approved April 22, 1996